CANUCK LAW
Reporting That You're Not Getting Elsewhere (Do Your Own Research To Verify)

NOVEMBER 26, 2025 BY RONNIE

# B.C. Property Rights Class Action: Signing Away Your Land For Peanuts?

No. 260720
New Westminster Registry

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

BETWEEN:

JASJEET RAMPEE GREWAL, on his own behalf and on behalf of all others similarly situated and affected, and
JOHN DOE, on his own behalf and on behalf of all others similarly situated and affected

Plaintiffs

AND:

HIS MAJESTY THE KING IN RIGHT OF THE PROVINCE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA and

HIS MAJESTY THE KING IN RIGHT OF CANADA

---

Back in August, the B.C. Supreme Court ruled that a section of land in Richmond actually belonged to the Cowichan Tribes. Understandably, this caused a lot of confusion for property and business owners, who learned about the decision after the fact. The case is being appealed, and that will be covered later.

It's being reported that a Proposed Class Action has been filed in New Westminister. The Notice of Civil Claim is available, and it lists two Proposed Representative Plaintiffs: (a) Jasjeet Grewal; and (b) John Doe, who is unidentified.

Grewal is the owner of a hazardous materials removal business, but lives in Burnaby. He pleads that, despite not living in Richmond, his business affairs are now in question. The unidentified Plaintiff pleads that he owns property in Richmond, and is directly impacted by the ruling.

The Governments of Canada and British Columbia are named as Defendants.

While there may be issues with the filing itself, there's a more immediate concern:

## Class Action For Compensation If Owners SIGN AWAY Rights

**Part 2: RELIEF SOUGHT**

The Plaintiffs, on behalf of themselves and the proposed Class, claim:

a. General damages for loss of property value and mental distress;
b. Special damages for loss of investment financing, or sale opportunities;
c. Restitution or disgorgement of taxes and fees collected under misrepresented conditions;
d. Punitive or exemplary damages;
e. A declaration that the Defendants' conduct was unlawful and contrary to their duties of good faith and candour;
f. A declaration requiring full disclosure of known risks affecting registered property in British Columbia

There are 6 different remedies being sought. 4 of them are for damages, and the others are for Declaratory Relief. Sounds great, doesn't it?

Despite the excitement that came with sharing this development, readers need to consider what's going on with this case. Nowhere in the N.O.C.C. does it state that it's fighting for landowners keeping their property. This lawsuit doesn't demand either the Federal or Provincial Governments do ***anything*** to prevent similar Court decisions from coming up.

Instead, it's to get property owners to ***sign away*** their rights in return for compensation.

Many have raised the argument that they shouldn't have to pay property taxes if they don't

actually own the property. That is a valid point. However, demanding tax refunds from the Government (either Canada or B.C.) will necessitate handing it over.

This is a suit over ***compensation*** not land ***protection***.

In Richmond specifically, probably the best argument landowners have is that they weren't notified the Cowichan case was going on until after the fact. They weren't able to participate, and were denied any sense of due process. That's certainly true. But will they still have those rights if they take the money?

Nowhere in the lawsuit do the Plaintiffs challenge the implementation of UNDRIP, which helped make this possible. There's nothing sought that would compel Governments to do more to protect property rights. Other than demands for future transparency, they aren't seeking any change at all.

## Notice Of Claim Has Some Procedural Defects

Let's have some fun with this one.

The "Class" doesn't appear to apply to either Representative Plaintiff. In paragraph 7, it lists people who may have suffered losses as a result of trying to refinance, sell, buy or mortgage property. Neither claim that they did, although perhaps it's just not stated.

To be fair, there are presumably Plaintiffs in B.C. who would only be seeking compensation for losses, and not looking to sell. But in that case, there should have been multiple subclasses. This needs to be cleared up.

The Plaintiffs here don't plead that they have been harmed or suffered damages.

Paragraph 8 states that the "Class" may also include all property owners in Provinces *other than* B.C., regardless of whether or not they suffered any losses. Again, this doesn't include Grewal or John Doe. It's unclear what grievances people from other regions could raise. This section is so vague it could also mean Plaintiffs living where there are no land claims whatsoever.

The torts aren't adequately pleaded. When making these kinds of allegations, there's a requirement to "provide particulars", or to spell out in details what has happened. There are claims of negligence, deceit and malfeasance, but nothing is laid out. Who? What? Where? When? The Claim could be amended easily enough, but this information has to be there.

The N.O.C.C. doesn't actually state that it will be seeking a Certification Order, although it may be assumed.

******In fairness, this isn't the sort of disaster case that is normally covered here. But, there are some procedural issues that may come up. None of it should be fatal though, and better drafting should fix these errors.***

With this in mind, it doesn't change the primary concern: this lawsuit seems designed to convince Plaintiffs to hand over their land. Yes, it's a cynical take. Do you really think you'll be allowed to keep it once that tax refund goes through?

Sure, Plaintiffs may get *some* of their cash back, but will almost certainly be expected to sign away their deed in return. Does that seem worth it?

Also consider: in Class Actions, the lawyers typically have wide latitude to settle suits. This means that individual Plaintiffs may get very little in terms of their "tax refunds". Then the lawyers will take some 30% to 45% from each client for fees.

CLASS ACTION COURT DOCUMENTS:
(1) Grewal Doc 001 Class Action Notice Of Civil Claim

COWICHAN RULING OF AUGUST, 2025:
(1) https://www.canlii.org/en/bc/bcsc/doc/2025/2025bcsc1490/2025bcsc1490.html

(1) https://news.gov.bc.ca/releases/2022AG0065-000611
(2) https://news.gov.bc.ca/files/CivilLitigationDirectives.pdf

**INDIGENOUS, LAND GRAB, PROPERTY RIGHTS**

## One Reply to “B.C. Property Rights Class Action: Signing Away Your Land For Peanuts?”

**Jason Palser**

**NOVEMBER 27, 2025 AT 5:11 AM**

Pretty sure we’ll all own nothing and be happy. This is just the start. Then our ‘first nations’ will get screwed and lose it all too. Good times. I love the WEF now.